

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TEXARKANA DIVISION**

QUENTIN WILSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

OFFICER ELAINE JEWELL,

Defendant.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:20-CV-00141-RWS-CMC

**ORDER**

Plaintiff Quentin Wilson, proceeding *pro se*, filed the above-styled and numbered civil action complaining of alleged violations of his constitutional rights. The case was referred to the United States Magistrate Judge in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636. After the lawsuit was filed, an information packet was sent to Wilson by the Clerk of the Court, but was returned with a notation reading “return to sender, unable to forward.” Bowie County Jail records show Wilson was released from jail on September 2, 2020. He has not notified the Court of his mailing address or current whereabouts since that date.

The lawsuit form that Wilson filed contains a declaration reading as follows: “I understand, if I am released or transferred, it is my responsibility to keep the court informed of my current mailing address and failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this lawsuit.” Docket No. 1 at 4. The Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending dismissal of Wilson’s lawsuit for failure to prosecute (Docket No. 6), and a copy of the Report was sent to Wilson at his last known address, return receipt requested. That copy was also returned with the same notation. Docket No. 7. Over seven months have passed since the copy of the Report was returned as undeliverable and Wilson has not updated the Court with a current mailing address.

Because no objections have been received, Wilson is barred from *de novo* review by the District Judge of those findings, conclusions, and recommendations and, except upon grounds of plain error, from appellate review of the unobjected-to factual findings and legal conclusions accepted and adopted by the District Court. *Duarte v. City of Lewisville, Texas*, 858 F.3d 348, 352 (5th Cir. 2017). The Court has reviewed the pleadings and the Report of the Magistrate Judge and has determined that the Report is correct. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (where no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law."). It is accordingly

**ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 6) is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of this Court. It is further

**ORDERED** that the above-styled civil action is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** for failure to prosecute.

**So ORDERED and SIGNED this 28th day of June, 2021.**

  
ROBERT W. SCHROEDER III  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE